



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,997	12/20/2001	Gregory J. Wolff	015358-006800US	3773
20350	7590	10/05/2006	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ROSARIO, DENNIS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/028,997	WOLFF ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Rosario	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-27 and 29-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 24 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-23,25,27 and 29-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment was received on 8/24/2006. Claims 1,3-27 and 29-77 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive since all the limitations of claim 26 were not reproduced in claims 1, 17, 18, 24, 25, 27,45,46,52,54,57,71 and 72.
3. Applicant's arguments, see amendment page 22, section Dependent Claims, filed 8/24/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 53 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Takahashi (US Patent 6,867,882 B1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi (US Patent 6,867,882 B1).

Regarding claim 18, Takahashi discloses a method of generating a customized digital image the method comprising:

- a) receiving (via “print layout memory” in col. 12, line 34 that stores which is interpreted as receiving) a first digital image (fig. 15,num. 203) using an image capture device (fig. 12,num. 101) having a selectable mode (fig. 5, num. S11) for capturing (via “print layout memory” in col. 12, line 34 is interpreted as capturing since the memory stores which is also interpreted to mean capturing) a template image (as shown in fig. 16);
- b) analyzing the first digital image by applying an image analysis technique to the first digital image (a user decides where to move the images and enlarge or reduce images via a pointer as shown in fig. 15,num. 1201) to determine a first placement region (fig. 16, label: IMAGE 2 was moved to a new location relative “IMAGE 2” of fig. 12) on the first digital image (fig. 16,num. 203) for placing a second digital image; and
- c) placing the second digital image (as shown in fig. 15, label: IMAGE 2) in the first placement region (as shown in fig. 2, label: IMAGE 2) on the first digital image (fig. 16,num. 203 is the same image as fig. 15,num. 203) to generate the customized digital image (as shown in fig. 20).

Regarding claim 25, Takahashi discloses a method of generating a customized digital image using a digital camera, the method comprising:

- a) using the digital camera (fig. 13,num. 101) to capture one or more images (as shown in fig. 14, labels: IMAGE 1 thru IMAGE 5) with the digital camera operative in a first mode (via fig. 5,num. S13);
- b) using the digital camera to capture (via fig. 12,num. 1304) a template image (as shown in fig. 16) with the digital camera in a second mode (via fig. 5,num. S12), the template image comprising one or more bounded regions, each bounded region of the one or more bounded regions identifying a location (or POSITION as shown in fig. 17) on the template image for placing an image of the one or more images captured using the digital camera; and
- c) obtaining the customized image (as shown in fig. 20) from the digital camera, wherein the customized digital image is generated by placing a copy (via a pointer in fig. 15,num. 1201 and fig. 16) of at least one image (as shown in fig. 16, label IMAGE 2) from the one or more images in at least one bounded region on the template image (as shown in fig. 16, label IMAGE 2).

6. Claims 17,45 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Simon et al. (US Patent Application Publication No.: US 2002/0040375 A1 or serial number 09/825,453).

Regarding claim 17 Simon et al. discloses a method of generating a customized digital image, the method comprising:

- a) receiving a signal (via the input of fig. 5,num. 110) comprising:
 - a1) digital signals representative of a plurality of digital images (as shown in fig. 5,num. 100), the plurality of digital images captured using an image capture device (fig. 1, num. 20 is interpreted as a capture device since num. 20 stores the images where the action of storing is interpreted to also mean capturing);
- b) determining a template image (fig. 5,num. 160) from the plurality of digital images (fig. 5,num. 100) based upon a selection entered (at fig. 1,num. 110) via the image capture device (fig. 1, num. 20);
- c) determining one or more placement regions (fig. 17,num. 286) from the template image by applying an image analysis technique (via the method of fig. 7) to the template image, each placement region of the one or more placement regions identifying a location on the template image for receiving a digital image (as shown in fig. 15,num. 60) from the plurality of digital images;
- d) identifying, for each placement region of the one or more placement regions, a digital image from the plurality of digital images to be placed in the placement region (as shown in fig. 15,num. 60); and

e) for each placement region of the one or more placement regions, placing a copy (Fig. 13,num. 62 is a copy relative to fig. 11,num. 62) of a digital image from the plurality of digital images identified for the placement region in the placement region to generate the customized digital image (as shown in fig. 13).

Claim 45 is rejected the same as claim 17. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 17 is equally applicable to claim 45 except for the limitation of:

- a) a processor (fig. 8,num. 802); and
- b) a memory (fig. 8,num. 804) coupled to the processor.

Claim 71 is rejected the same as claim 17. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 17 is equally applicable to claim 71 except for the additional limitation disclosed in Simon et al. of a computer program product (fig. 1,num. 20).

7. Claims 1,3-5,7-16,19-22,27,29-31,33-44,46-50,52,54-60,62-70 and 72-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shaffer et al. (US Patent 6,396,963 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Shaffer et al. discloses a method of generating a customized digital image, the method comprising:

- a) receiving a first digital image (via the inputs of fig. 7, num. 152) from an image capture device (or scanner of fig. 7,num. 157) having a selector for identifying the first digital image as a template image (fig. 9,num. 164 is interpreted as a selector for identifying. Since the scanner of fig. 7,num. 157 scans the sheet of fig. 9,num. 160 the scanner is inputting or having a selector or identifier as shown in fig. 9,num. 164 that is used to identify the first digital image as shown in fig. 9,num. 160 after scanning. Note that the claimed selector is interpreted to perform the action of identifying and not selecting.);
- b) determining one or more placement regions (fig. 9 shows at the top left one placement region or the smaller rectangle enclosed by a larger rectangle) from the first digital image (top left larger rectangle) by applying an image analysis technique (“pattern recognition” in col. 13, line 13) to the first digital image, each placement region of the one or more placement regions identifying a location on the first digital image for placing a digital image from a first set of digital images (one image from fig. 7, num. 45);
- c) identifying (via fig. 7,num. 149), for each placement region of the one or more placement regions, a digital image from the first set of digital images to be placed in the placement region; and

d) for each placement region of the one or more placement regions, placing a digital image (via fig. 6, label: "If new template, place proper picture into template." Note that fig. 6 is a digital version; thus all processing of figure 6 is digital.) from the first set of digital images identified (via fig. 7, num. 149) for the placement region (or layout of fig. 7,num. 157) in the placement region to generate the customized digital image (the output of fig. 7,num. 157.).

Regarding claim 3, Shaffer et al. discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising:

a) creating a link (or "list of images" in col. 13, line 22) between the customized digital image and at least one digital image ("high resolution image" in col. 13, line 23) from a second set of digital images (or "image storage" in col. 13, line 24), wherein the link enables access to the at least one digital image from the second set of digital images using the customized digital image (or "scanned layout sheets" in col. 13, line 26).

Claim 4 is rejected the same as claim 3. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 3 is equally applicable to claim 4 except for requiring the limitation of a user as disclosed in Shaffer et al. via a "Customer" in fig. 7,num. 14.

Regarding claim 5, Shaffer et al. discloses the method of claim 1 wherein receiving the first digital image comprises:

a) scanning a paper medium on which the one or more placement region have been indicated to generate the first digital image (via the last step of fig. 5 (Analog version)).

Regarding claim 7, Shaffer et al. discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the one or more placement regions on the first digital image are indicated by one or more bounded regions (as shown by the smaller rectangles of fig. 9).

Regarding claim 8, Shaffer et al. discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the one or more placement regions on the first digital image are indicated by one or more text fragments (fig. 8, num. 119 or fig. 9.num. 164).

Claim 9 is rejected the same as claim 8. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 8 is equally applicable to claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, Shaffer et al. teaches the method of claim 1 wherein identifying, for each placement region of the one or more placement regions, a digital image from the first set of digital images to be placed in the placement region comprises:

- a) determining image identification information (via “pattern recognition” in col. 13, line 13) associated with at least a first placement region of the one or more placement regions from the first digital image, the image identification information identifying an attribute (“embedded...data” in col. 12, lines 63,64) of a digital image to be placed in the at least first placement region;
- b) identifying a first digital image from the first set of digital images to be placed in the at least first placement region based upon the image identification information (or “image identification” in col. 13, line 21) associated with the at least first placement region (via “image stickers” in col. 12, lines 61,62 that was placed in any one rectangle of fig. 9.).

Claim 11 is rejected the same as claim 10. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 10 is equally applicable to claim 11.

Claim 12 is rejected the same as claim 10. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 10 is equally applicable to claim 12 except for the additional limitation of a time stamp which is disclosed in Shaffer et al. in col. 11, line 66: "data and time" or "image identification" in col. 12, line 18 which is used for embedding into an image in col. 12, line 18-21.

Regarding claim 13, Shaffer et al. discloses the method of claim 1 wherein placing a digital image from the first set of digital images identified for the placement region in the placement region to generate the customized digital image comprises:

- a) adjusting (or "zoom and crop" in col. 13, line 32) the digital image to fit the placement region.

Claim 14,15 and 16 are rejected the same as claim 13. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 13 is equally applicable to claims 14,15 and 16.

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected the same as claim 3. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 3 is equally applicable to claims 19 and 20.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected the same as claims 4 and 5. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 4 and 5 is equally applicable to claims 21 and 22.

Claim 27 are rejected the same as claim 1. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 27 except for the additional limitation disclosed in Shaffer et al.:

a) an input module (the inputs of fig. 7,num. 152);

b) a processing module (fig. 7,num. 152);

c) wherein the input module is configured to receive a first digital image

captured with an image capture device (via a scanner of fig. 7,num. 157) operable in a first mode and a second mode, the first mode for capturing a template image (not that the remaining limitation is interpreted as intended use as is given no weight); and

d) wherein the processing module is configured to perform the method of

claim 1, addressed above.

Claims 29-31 and 33-42 are rejected the same as claims 3-5 and 7-16, respectively. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 3-5 and 7-16 is equally applicable to claims 29-31 and 33-42, respectively.

Regarding claim 43, Shaffer et al. discloses a digital camera ("digital camera" in col. 13, line 37) that incorporates the system of claim 27.

Regarding claim 44, Shaffer et al. discloses a copying machine (or scanner of fig. 7,num. 157) that incorporates the system of claim 27.

Claim 46 is rejected the same as claim 1. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 46 except for the additional limitation disclosed in Shaffer et al.:

- a) a processor (fig. 4,num. 94); and
- b) a memory (fig. 4,num. 102) for storing a program;
- c) wherein the processor is operative with the program to:
 - c1) receive a first digital image; and
 - c2) receive a second digital image (via fig. 4,num. 104).

Claims 47-50 are rejected the same as claims 19-22. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 19-22 is equally applicable to claims 47-50.

Claims 52 and 54 are rejected the same as claim 46. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 46 is equally applicable to claims 52 and 54.

Claims 55 and 56 are rejected the same as claims 43 and 44. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 43 and 44 is equally applicable to claims 55 and 56.

Claim 57 is rejected the same as claim 1. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 57 except for the additional limitation as disclosed in Shaffer et al. of a computer program product (fig. 4,num. 102).

Claims 58-60 and 62-67 are rejected the same as claims 3-5 and 7-12, respectively. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 3-5 and 7-12 is equally applicable to claims 58-60 and 62-67, respectively.

Claim 68 is rejected the same as claims 13 and 16. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 13 and 16 is equally applicable to claim 68.

Claims 69 and 70 are rejected the same as claims 14 and 15. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 14 and 15 is equally applicable to claims 69 and 70.

Claim 72 is rejected the same as claim 57. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 57 is equally applicable to claim 72.

Claims 73-76 are rejected the same as claims 19-22. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claims 19-22 is equally applicable to claims 73-76.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6,23,32,51,61 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (US Patent 6,396,963 B2) in view of Anderson (US Patent 6,690,396 B1).

Regarding claim 6, Shaffer et al. does not teach photographing a paper medium to generate the claimed first digital image, but does teach two methods (figures 5 and 6) of generating the claimed first digital image. Thus, Shaffer et al. suggests that there is a plurality of methods that can be used to generate the claimed first digital image.

Anderson et al. teaches another method of creating the claimed first digital image as shown in figure 2 and the additional limitation of:

a) photographing (via a "CCD...[or]...capture device" in col. 9, lines 65-67) a paper medium (or "TANGIBLE MEDIUM" of fig. 1,num. 102) on which the one or more placement regions have been indicated (as shown in fig. 2,num. 204) to generate the first digital image (fig. 2,num. 202).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shaffer et al.'s two methods of figure 5 and 6 to generate the claimed first digital image with Anderson et al.'s teaching of using a CCD or capture

device, because Anderson et al.'s teaching does not limit the types of devices and provides a plurality of devices for generating the claimed first digital image.

Claims 23,32,51,61 and 77 are rejected the same as claim 6. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 6 is equally applicable to claims 23,32,51,61 and 77.

10. Claims 18-23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (US Patent 6,690,396 B1) in view of Takahashi (US Patent 6,867,882 B1).

Regarding claim 18, Anderson teaches a method of generating a customized digital image, the method comprising:

- a) receiving a first digital image (via the input of fig. 1,num. 106 as shown in fig. 2 via output arrow of fig. 1,num. 104) using an image capture device (fig. 8,num. 818) having a selectable mode for capturing a template image;
- b) analyzing the first digital image (Fig. 1, num. 106) by applying an image analysis technique (or “correlation” in col. 3, line 46 that identifies features, fig. 2, numerals 204-216.) to the first digital image to determine a first placement region (fig. 2,num. 204) on the first digital image for placing a second digital image (“3 X 5 PHOTOGRAPH” in fig. 2,num. 204 after scanning.);
- c) placing the second digital image in the first placement region on the first digital image (fig. 3, num. 312 via a format operation) to generate the customized digital image (as shown in fig. 4,num. 402).

Anderson does not teach the claimed having a selectable mode for capturing a template image. However, Anderson does suggest that a plurality of capture devices can be used as shown in fig. 8,numerals 818,820 and 822.

Takahashi teaches one such image capture device as shown in fig. 21,num. 101 that can be used with Anderson’s fig. 8, numerals 818,820 and 822 and the remaining limitation of:

a) an image capture device (fig. 21,num. 101) having a selectable mode (fig. 24, num. S81) for capturing a template image (as done in fig. 26,num. S105 that stores a “PRINT IMAGE” shown and described in fig. 26,num. S105 that includes a “TEMPLATE IMAGE” shown and described in fig. 26,num. S105).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Anderson’s teaching of using a plurality of image capture devices with Takahashi’s image capture device that enables “image process operations [that] become easy and convenient for the user” in col. 15, lines 59,60.

Regarding claim 19, Anderson discloses the method of claim 18 wherein the second digital image is a copy (or “thumbnail” in col. 5, line 58) of a third digital image (or “expanded view” in col. 5, line 58).

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected the same as claim 19. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 19 is equally applicable to claims 20 and 21.

Regarding claim 22 see figure 1, numerals 102 and 104.

Regarding claim 23, Anderson discloses a “CCD” in col. 9, line 65.

11. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (US Patent 6,396,963 B2) in view of Takahashi (US Patent 6,867,882 B1).

Regarding claim 53, Shaffer et al. does not teach the limitations of claim 53 with respect to said digital camera; however, Shaffer et al. suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that a plurality of image capture devices can be used as shown in fig. 2, numerals 8,12,10 and 6.

Takahashi teaches one such image capture device as shown in fig. 13,num. 101 and the remaining limitations of claim 53 of:

a) a first button (fig. 13,num. 206) which when selected indicates (via a screen as shown in fig 13,num. 203) that an image received by the digital camera is a template image (as shown in fig. 15).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shaffer et al.'s teaching of using a plurality of image capture devices with Takahashi's image capture device that enables "image process operations [that] become easy and convenient for the user" in col. 15, lines 59,60.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claim 24 is allowed.

13. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claim 24 is allowable because the prior art does not teach the limitation of capturing a template image by imaging a paper medium with the digital camera in a second mode.

The closest prior art, Takahashi (US Patent 6,867,882) teaches that a camera that has a second mode as shown in fig. 5,num. S12 that is used for templates or layouts; however, the templates or layouts were obtained from a "hard disk" in col. 14, line 28 and not by imaging a paper medium with the digital camera in a second mode.

Another prior art, Anderson (US Patent 6,690,396 B1) teaches scanning a paper medium (fig. 1,num. 104) with a scanner in order to obtain a template and not capturing a template image by imaging a paper medium with a digital camera in a second mode.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

14. Claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 26 is allowable for similar reasons as claim 24.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yokota et al. (US Patent 6,282,330 B1) is pertinent as teaching a method of storing template images, fig. 3,num. 1310, and captured images, fig. 3,num. 1150) in a single device as shown in fig. 3,num. 1530.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Rosario whose telephone number is (571) 272-7397. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DR
Dennis Rosario
Unit 2624


DANIEL MIRIAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER